DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE
CANADA

OPERATIONAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Directorate of Social and Economic Analysis

Research Note 6/93

WHITHER DEMOCRACY AND SECURITY?

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE FORUM ON "THE WORLDWIDE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY" AND THE CONFERENCE ON POST-COLD WAR PEACE AND SECURITY

BY

WILLIAM PUGSLEY
AND
ERIK SOLEM

June 1993

OTTAWA, CANADA

National Defence Défense nationale

Operational Research and Analysis

CATEGORIES OF PUBLICATION

ORA Reports are the most authoritative and most carefully considered publications issued. They normally embody the results of major research activities or are significant works of lasting value or provide a comprehensive view on major defence initiatives. ORA Reports are approved by DGOR and are subject to peer review.

ORA Project Reports record the analysis and results of studies conducted for specific sponsors. This category is the main vehicle to report completed research to the sponsors and may also describe a significant milestone in ongoing work. They are approved by DGOR and are subject to peer review. They are released initially to sponsors and may, with sponsor approval, be released to other agencies having an interest in the material.

Directorate Research Notes are issued by directorates. They are intended to outline, develop or document proposals, ideas, analysis or models which do not warrant more formal publication. They may record development work done in support of sponsored projects which could be applied elsewhere in the future. As such they help serve as the corporate scientific memory of the directorate.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

CANADA

OPERATIONAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

DIRECTORATE OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

WHITHER DEMOCRACY AND SECURITY?

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE FORUM ON "THE WORLDWIDE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY" AND THE CONFERENCE ON POST-COLD WAR PEACE AND SECURITY

BY

WILLIAM PUGSLEY
AND
ERIK SOLEM

Directorate Research Notes are written to document material which does not warrant or require more formal publication. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views of the Establishment or the Department of National Defence

OTTAWA, CANADA

JUNE 1993

ABSTRACT

This report provides an overview and assessment of a major international study conference on International Peace and Security and it relevance to Canadian Security Policy.

RÉSUME

Ce document offre une vue d'ensemble et une évaluation d'une conférence d'envergure internationale portant sur la Paix internationale et la Sécurité et de son impact sur la Politique de la Sécurite canadienne.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT/RÉSUMÉ i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

1. **INTRODUCTION** 1
   - Purpose and Organization of Report 1
   - Background of the Mershon Center 3
   - Observations on Particular Relevance 5

2. **FORUM ON THE WORLD-WIDE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY** 7
   - Key Points.....7
   - Assessment 9

3. **POST-COLD WAR PEACE AND SECURITY** 11
   - General Introduction 11
   - Reflections on NAFTA and U.S. Foreign Policy ...12
   - Scholarly Research and the Foreign Policy .....14 Process
   - On Knowledge and the Application of Research ...15
   - The Entry point for 'Knowledge' into the Policy.16 Process
   - The 'Separate Worlds" of Academics and Policy ..18 Makers: How to Bridge the Gap
   - On Religion, the Use of Force and Politics 18
   - Whither Russia? 19
   - Justice, Morality and U.S. Foreign Policy .....20 Making
   - The Future of U.S. Intelligence.....23

4. **GENERAL CONCLUSIONS** 26

ANNEX A: PRELIMINARY PROGRAM CONFERENCE ON POST-COLD...A-1 WAR PEACE AND SECURITY

ANNEX B: OHIO ARMS CONTROL SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS LIST ...B-1

ANNEX C: THE OHIO ARMS CONTROL SEMINAR C-1

ANNEX D: U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE FACT SHEET D-1

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Organization of this Report

1. The principal purpose of this report is to provide an overview and assessment of a major international study conference which was held at the Mershon Centre, at Ohio State University, U.S.A. We would like to draw conclusions, and to bring out points of potential relevance to Canadian security policy. In the process we will highlight what seems to us to be major points and findings which could usefully be taken into account by our own strategists and policy planners.

2. The Mershon Centre at Ohio State University is a major graduate research institute with a long-standing and well-deserved reputation for academic excellence in the areas of international peace and security studies. As a result of previous professional contact with Mershon Centre, one of us (Dr. Solem) was invited to participate with a guest, in this event. Consequently, the present authors took part as delegates to the 25th Anniversary Forum and Conference.

3. A major 'drawing card' of this international event was a "Forum on the Worldwide Future of Democracy," by invitation only, addressed by Dr. Oscar Arias Sanchez, Mr. Hans Dietrich Genscher, and Dr. Henry A. Kissinger.

4. As most readers will know Dr. Arias, President of Costa Rica 1986-90 and Nobel Peace Prize Winner (1987), orchestrated a peace plan for strife-torn Central America. He is the Head of the Arias Foundation for Peace and Human Progress and the Centre for Peace and Reconciliation, both of which are located in San José, Costa Rica.

5. Likewise, Hans Dietrich Genscher should not be a stranger to security policy advisors, strategic analysts, or policy planners. He was for 16 years Foreign Minister of FRG (West Germany) and a source of profound importance to the shaping and direction of the Free Democratic Party, which has played a key role in the evolution of German post-war political developments. As the result of his achievements Mr. Genscher was awarded West Germany's Great Cross of the Order of Merit.

6. Dr. Henry Kissinger, as almost everyone knows, is a statesman/scholar of world-wide renown. He was U.S. Secretary of State 1973-1977 as well as Assistant to the President for National Security (1969-1975). In 1983 the then President Reagan appointed Dr. Kissinger as Chairman of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America. From 1984 to 1990 he was a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

7. Apart from Dr. Arias, who had to return to his country due to sudden political developments, the other two panellists took part in the following study conference as well, with Dr. Kissinger privately addressing the group at a breakfast meeting.

8. In order to capture all the main points and the flair of this Conference we have chosen to review and assess the events as they unfolded. In the following section we will discuss and describe the background, working methods and central location of the Mershon Center itself (for those who may be unfamiliar with this research organization). We will offer some observations on their particular relevance.

9. Part II of the report will focus in on the "Forum on the Worldwide Future for Democracy," the importance of which is more clearly grasped after the above introduction of the panellists. We will adumbrate and discuss the key points, while providing a brief assessment of the elaborative processes of the subsequent sessions.

10. Part III of this report then turns to the "Post-Cold War Peace and Security" instalment of this international study conference. Here we will identify and discuss significant points, draw some conclusions from them and provide an assessment.

11. The final part of this report consists of general conclusions of what was said and agreed upon. We will provide some suggestions and recommend follow-up action, where appropriate.

Background on the Mershon Center

12. The Mershon Center of the Ohio-State University is a multidisciplinary research community concerned with questions of international security and peace. It works through a series of innovative scholarship and educational initiatives.

13. The Center's "Godfather," Ralph D. Mershon, was an 1890 graduate of Ohio State University and an electrical engineer, who amassed 93 U.S. patents during his career. Thanks to his innovations, the efficient long-distance transmission of high-voltage electricity was made possible. Thanks to his benevolence, Ohio State University became the principal beneficiary of his estate.

14. Colonel Mershon's will stipulated that whereas the principal of the donation be kept intact its not inconsiderable interest should be divided into two parts. One part was to be made available for use as the University Board Trustees saw fit. The Mershon Auditorium, which was dedicated in 1957 is a commemoration of this bequest. The second part of the income (to be no less than 50%) as stipulated should be used in a manner "to promote and encourage research and education on international security."

15. Hence, the Mershon Center was established in 1967. As a multidisciplinary academic unit it explores critical issues of war and peace through problem-oriented research and education. It aims at achieving a better understanding of the role of collective violence (and its avoidance) in the past and present. The Center also attempts to further the collective knowledge about military and non-military means of conflict avoidance and conflict resolution internationally.

16. In addition to Colonel Mershon's endowment, which forms its financial base, the Center also receives grants and contracts from charitable foundations, governmental agencies and several international organizations for ongoing projects.

17. The Mershon Centre is lead by Dr. Charles F. Herman, who heads a group of some 35 faculty associates and a number of advanced graduate students. There are three primary sets of major research programs. These are:

- International Security and Military Affairs,
- Citizenship Development for a Global Age,
- Foreign Policy Analysis.

18. During the summer of 1993, which is the beginning of its 25 Anniversary, the Mershon Center will move into new quarters, occupying what is known to be an architecturaly striking building with comfortable and expanded facilities. A campaign has also been initiated for the establishment of two endowed faculty chairs to reside within the Center itself. The Wayne Woodrow Hayes Chair in International Security will study the many-faceted and persistent problems of war, the means of its avoidance, limitation and techniques associated with its termination. The Peace Chair draws on a program of peace studies which is evolving at Ohio State University. Central questions which it will address are peace bargaining, processes of negotiation and conflict resolution.

Observations on Particular Relevance

19. From a short glance and looked at superficially it may seem that the development of two endowed chairs on International Security and Peace respectively could be somewhat extravagant and inconsistent with the "end" of the Cold War. Furthermore, but perhaps only secondarily, these two chair could, due to their composition and themes, be seen to be at loggerheads with each other, which could complicate their respective working agendas. Let us consider these observations.

20. First, although the Cold War may officially be over many major and very serious problems remain. Chief among them is the continued spread of nuclear weapons and missile technology, to say nothing about the existence of chemical-based (and biological?) weapons of mass destruction; the lingering of unresolved civil wars and potential mass unrest in many parts of the world; future

incidents of terrorism as well as violent behaviour growing out of ethnic clashes and unrecognized or unreconciled nationalisms.

21. If this is not enough by itself, it also seems that the termination of our somewhat 'bipolar' focus in international politics is creating an intellectual vacuum which should be filled. The proper identification and understanding of these new problems and the development of new practical methods to solve or - failing that - resolve them must be developed.

22. Having observed at close quarters the working of the Mershon Center and having participated actively in their recent 25 Anniversary Forum and Conference it is our considered opinion that the Center is 'on to a good thing' and is definitely on the right track. Furthermore, having examined the process of 'decompartmentalization' of current security related problems, from a technical as well as a political base, there is no doubt in our mind that the two planned endowed chairs of International Security and Peace, instead of 'contradicting' each other, will be of complementary value perhaps even in a major sense. We look forward to the possibility of revisiting and reviewing these impressions at a later stage.

II FORUM ON THE WORLD WIDE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

Key Points

23. The principal speakers for this international study conference were well chosen to give the respective themes a truly global perspective. Two of the three panellists, Drs. Oscar Arias and Henry Kissinger are Nobel Laureates in Peace. Several known academics as well as officials in the U.S. Executive branch participated in discussions following the forum. Some of them were also speakers in the subsequent sessions. More about this later on; now to the significant points of the forum itself.

24. Dr. Arias stated that global affairs in general are now increasingly being decided by anti-democratic means. None of the developing world countries are represented in either the G-7 Group or U.N. Security Council, which is where all the key international security questions are being deliberated and decided.

25. Pragmatism, not realism, is a principal weakness of U.S. foreign policy, as he sees it. In his mind there is a direct link from trade to democratization, and this link must not be broken.

26. The worldwide future of democracy will depend on the future of the destitute. Here Dr. Arias was referring to the large proportion of developing countries in the lowest income tier and to the ratio of wealth at high to low income scales. Canada and Japan were cited as world leaders in this respect, and countries to which world attention would increasingly turn.

27. Hans Dietrick Genscher's presentation was, to our mind, very cautious. He does not see democracy as a "fragile flower," which was implied somewhat by the previous speaker. The break-up of the USSR as well as the recent Russian referendum are viewed as 'hopeful' signs.

28. Henry Kissinger's main point in the forum (he participated in the subsequent sessions as well) was that the U.S. has lacked, and continues to lack, a point of reference for foreign policy since the end of the cold war. There has never been a Russia like now (i.e. 'democratic'). The present situation is one which he views primarily as a "struggle among ex-communists."

29. Furthermore, what is needed in U.S. foreign policy is a concept of equilibrium, along the lines of Japan, which is now re-arming to develop military superiority with Korea and China.

30. Dr. Kissinger dismisses environmental concerns as 'not real concerns.' He feels that environmentalists will forever remain unsatisfied, hence their 'needs' (which he dismisses) can never be fully met.

31. Should the U.S. intervene in Bosnia? If so, it could well be the "beginning of the end" of the U.S. to have an influence in world affairs.

32. Since the dominant trend in Russia is nationalistic, there is very little that the U.S., or anyone else, can do to change this.

33. Kissinger's final main point in the forum was that the U.S. has been too slow to show its intention with China,

(for example with regard to the most favoured nation status). China considers the U.S. as a good link in the strategic balance with Japan.

Assessment

34. Dr. Arias, although being the most 'emotional' of the presenters, received the greatest response from the audience. An attempt to elucidate some of his views at the subsequent reception proved unsuccessful, since he did not participate due to an abrupt departure to his own country for urgent political reasons involving a Supreme Court judge highjacking incident the day before, where 18 justices had been held hostage for several hours in Costa Rica's Supreme Court building.

35. Hans Dietrick Genscher had provided the lowest profile during the formal presentations, hence we wanted to explore his views further. During a 20 minutes private conversation with the former German Foreign Secretary and former Head of the Free Democratic Party it transpired that he was in fact rather optimistic on both the subject of the future of democracy and (to a specific question) the future of the European Community (E.C.). He felt European integration would continue, but that it would take new forms. Denmark's role in this process, through its second referendum on the Maastricht Treaty, could prove to be crucial. Much rides on this, not only in terms of Denmark's future within the new security architecture in Europe but also for Britain's chances to accept the EC obligations as set forth in Maastricht. Mr. Genscher was optimistic on both fronts. These views amplified and explained his earlier position in the forum.

36. Henry Kissinger elaborated on some of the trials and tribulations of policy making in Washington and provided interesting and useful personal comments, which he was to elaborate on during a subsequent breakfast session (later in this report).

37. Our general assessment of the forum on the world-wide future of democracy and subsequent private and direct discussion with two (of the three) panellists confirms that not only were the speakers of considerable complementary importance but that this was indeed a well-chosen and significant beginning to the elaborations which were to follow.

III POST-COLD WAR PEACE AND SECURITY

General Introduction

38. As already stated in our trip report[1] the themes for this conference were:

a. the worldwide future of democracy
b. applied and scholarly research and the foreign policy process
c. expanding knowledge and promoting education about peace in a complicated world
d. religious perspectives on the use of force
e. the global law and order deficit
f. intelligence policy for the post-cold war era: a Clinton administration view
g. whither Russia.

39. In addition to the three forum panellists, whose deliberations and conclusions have already been discussed, other prominent spokespersons also took part. One of these was the Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, a former President of Notre Dame University and a leading policy advocate in the Catholic Church. Other key delegates included Dr. Chester Crocker, former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs (1981 - 89), currently Chairman of the Board of Directors, the U.S. Institute for Peace; and Dr. Gregory Treverton, Deputy Director of the National Intelligence Council (January 1993 -). Six military officers from the US Army and Air Force, and a host of academic representatives

---

1 See Memorandum to CFD Trip Report - Conference on Post-Cold War Peace and Security, by W.I. Pugsley, DG Met OC, 4 May 1993

and other experts on international peace and security also participated. The authors of this report were the only two participants from outside the U.S. (except for the principal speakers noted). A list of delegates and their affiliations is appended to this report.

Reflections on NAFTA and U.S. Foreign Policy

40. Turning now to the subsequent sessions, **Dr. Henry Kissinger** felt that he had left out an important point during the previous night's forum. This related to NAFTA, which he felt can be a historic event but one that the U.S. Administration is presently in the process of 'blowing' (those were his words). As long as he had known Mexico, and he had known every Mexican Administration for a very long time, they had been dominated by the vision of the U.S. as "gringos" wanting to control their country. This had started to improve under President de Maderiaga, and is now - for the moment - greatly improved under President Salinas, whom he described as a remarkable leader with unique and important qualities.

41. According to Kissinger, the great opportunity for U.S. foreign policy is not with Yeltsin - whether he stands or falls is a marginal consequence to the U.S. That is simply 'damage limitation.' The great opportunity in the Western Hemisphere is to 'push through' NAFTA the way the U.S. has pushed through other great initiatives before. However, the American public does not understand what is at stake. In Mexico there will be a Presidential election next year. If President Salinas fails to get the agreement into proper shape, the orientation of Mexican politics will be destroyed for a very long time to come, because he (Salinas)

is a highly unusual personality and this is a unique opportunity in U.S.-Mexican relations.

42. From Kissinger's knowledge of Mexican Administrators, and he knew many of them very well, theirs was (is) the best government in the Western Hemisphere right now - they are better than any European governments, or Clinton's, or Bush's. They (the Mexicans) are willing to pass an environmental law but the U.S., according to Kissinger, will not tell them what the U.S. wants. If you are a Mexican, he said, and "I don't know what goes on in the complex mind of Mickey Kantor - he wants the option of telling them that he does not want the law and he wants it amended --- so that he can run around in Hollywood and say that he scored a high victory" -- But, Kissinger continued putting himself in the position of the Mexicans - the 'gringos' are telling them not just that they <u>have</u> to pass a law, which they have accepted, but <u>what</u> law. This is impossible! How can Americans be part of the law enforcement of Mexico when they (the Americans) won't let them (the Mexicans) enforce their (the US) laws?

43. Kissinger ended up arguing that the U.S. is so <u>driven</u> by domestic politics right now that it forgets the important opportunity facing it. He thinks that Clinton can go down in history as one of the most significant American presidents in terms of foreign policy, if he continues this Western Hemisphere policy. This was vintage Kissinger setting the stage for much interesting discussion and exchange of ideas to follow.

Scholarly Research and the Foreign Policy Process

44. The next agenda item was the important question of "Applied and Scholarly Research and the Foreign Policy Process," i.e. the link between (largely) academic research and policy making. Several important points were made. **Chester Crocker**, Former Assistant Secretary for African Affairs and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Institute for Peace[2] made a useful distinction between the 1) pure theorist, 2) the applied researcher and 3) the policy practitioner. Using the example of development, Crocker stated that for the pure theorist the most important question would most likely be "How to advance knowledge on development?" The applied researcher on the other hand would concern himself/herself with the question "How can we do development better?" For the policy practitioner the (same) question would become "How can we conduct a more efficient development policy?"

45. There are obvious similarities in the concern for the issue of development, but also quite clearly differences both in terms of goals and interests. Everyone has a 'conceptual framework' but the operating environments are often entirely different.

46. Using his own background as an example (applied researcher vs policy practitioner) Dr. Crocker had benefitted from having worked for Schulz - at the time Undersecretary of State who "listened magnificently" - there

[2] Dr. Crocker is currently Landegger Distinguished Research Professor at the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, Washington, D.C.

was no indication of what he thought[3]. This capacity, to listen, is in fact more important than would seem at first glance, as it draws out information and makes people see (or think) that there is real interest present. And, of course, if the 'listening' is done properly the real interest, should it not initially exist, could well develop and increase.

On Knowledge and the Application of Research

47. **Hrach Gregorian**, Director of Grants, Education and Training of the U.S. Institute for Peace made several, to our mind, significant points worth noting. He started out stating that some scholars are not particularly interested in the applications of their research, which he recognized. There are also scholars who do not want to sully their hands with government work, and that too he recognized. Then there are (policy) practitioners who have no time or patience for what scholars think, and he (Gregorian) could well understand that, given the type of information they receive.

48. Looking at foreign policy from the President's perspective (if one could be so presumptuous) the time at which this - i.e. the information from scholars and/or applied researchers - is going to be most important is as follows: The President starts out with a four year time frame; and that time frame continues to be contracted. Hence the maximum impact is within the first six months of the President's term in office; thereafter the President develops his contacts with other world leaders and continues

[3] This may be why Schulz was sometimes referred to as "the Sphinx."

to rely more and more on his own beliefs and instincts, hence to rely less and less on advice from others, especially from individuals outside his immediate staff.

49. This is of course different for different Presidents; there are, for example, Presidents with a more scholarly proclivity or tenet who may be less inclined to develop their own independent judgement. But the fact remains that knowledge has little impact beyond a certain level of immediacy, after which the leaders' intellectual capital, with which they have come into office, really "kicks in."

The Entry Point for 'Knowledge' into the Policy Process

50. The other major issue in this context is as follows: when we produce knowledge, at what level should it be entered into the policy process.[4] It is, Gregorian stated, extremely difficult to directly influence policy makers at the top because they often have primarily purely political issues in mind. These are as a rule different from issues which scholars most often have in mind. Therefore the 'entry point' will have to be at the mid level, that of the policy analyst, or "policy whack" as Gregorian stated. This is in fact the critical point at which to enter as very high level policy makers seldom or only very rarely read papers. They are much more inclined to rely on advice from their own people, on intelligence

[4] This applies to 'knowledge' (i.e. data, facts, information) produced outside government and entered into the process by academics, consultants or other 'knowledge' workers.

briefings as well as on articles and reports brought to their attention by staff.

51. In terms of volume, this is in fact not the most critical element when it comes to the gathering and production of knowledge or exposure, seen from a general point of view. Very large impacts are made by the New York Times (NYT) or the MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour, despite the fact that other newspapers or TV news programs have a much wider readership or audience.

52. Finally the informal networks in Washington carry inordinate importance when it comes to 'knowledge' and policy inputs. People are, in general, more prone to consult one another rather than to read papers. The real question is, therefore, how to get papers into the hands of those they (the policy makers) consult. And this is the middle layer. It is therefore important to gain access to these individuals by talking to them in the form of simulations, formal briefs, working groups (often half-day seminars), or when they are away from their offices and from day-to-day bureaucratic pressures.

53. As can be seen, it is now obvious that some departments are already setting up their own 'think-tanks,' for example Les Aspin in DOD, by bringing in Morton Halperin, Ash Carter and others. These individuals have of course been working for the chance of a more direct involvement for the past 12 years or so.

The 'Separate Worlds" of Academics and Policy Makers: How to Bridge the Gap

54. **Richard Herrmann** of the Mershon Center discussed the separate worlds inhabited by academics and policy makers. Scholars who may be known in Washington are often unknown among academics, and vice versa. They exist in very different cultures. There is frequently a lack of mutual respect, which is unfortunate. However, scholars are very welcome in the intelligence community, which bears certain similarities to their own working environments and which appreciates good scholarship.

55. The questions policy makers need answers to are: "what should we do?" (not "what is the problem?"); "why will it work?" "What will it cost?" "Why is it worth these costs?" "What will it do for us?" And finally, "who do we have to convince to make this happen?"

56. However, these are questions which scholars rarely ask, as in general they are much better at diagnostics.

On Religion, the Use of Force and Politics

57. On the question of the use of force and religion the principal points made were that religions have proven to be much more powerful and persistent than a lot of secularist thinkers had expected.

58. Of the three main world religions, Judaism and Christianity see themselves as the "victims" of war, rather than the "cause." The third, Islam, is a "warrior" religion historically. Introduction of more muslims into the U.S. military may prove difficult.

59. The basis of a "just war," involving proportionality (force should be proportionate to the objective) may be obsolete with modern powerful weapons (reference to nuclear weapons).

Whither Russia?

60. On the question of **Whither Russia?**, several interesting points were made. Among the most important were the following:

- U.S. Policy of promoting, encouraging privatization (which appeals to greed as a main motivator) should lead to economic intertwining,which in turn permits U.S. to use economic instruments (primarily trade) as a lever of power and influence.

- Russia has to complete the process of nation building and state building before it can have a definite foreign policy. Under "nation building," it has to establish its identity and common goal - What is Russia? This is made more difficult by the relationships with the 14 "near abroad" former Soviet states, which is the major foreign policy issue now in Russia. Under "state building," the question is whether to choose an executive or a parliamentary style of government. Many recent Yeltsin positions show his leaning toward the executive style, for example a delay of his Bosnian position until after the referendum, the timing of US/Russia Summit, and START 2.

- Russian foreign policy cannot have a military aspect except for arm sales abroad. And, at this particular stage, third world activism is really not possible.

- What is needed is a focus on "partnerships" to support the nation/state building (to avoid humiliation of receiving "aid").

- About 25% of workers in Russia are now in the market economy, but the mobility of workers is a problem. There is, for example, no inter-urban mobility; the signs of renovations and building in Moscow is an indication of foreigners buying up stores, as local Russians have no money.

- Organized crime in "endemic" in the market economy of Russia.

- The risk of conflict is greatest between Russia and Georgia rather than with Ukraine but a clash with Georgia may draw Ukraine in. However, there is not a large chance of this unless there is an internal revolution inside Ukraine.

Justice, Morality and U.S. Foreign Policy Making

61. With respect to the question on Justice, Morality and U.S. Foreign Policy several points of interest were made.

62. The collapse of the Soviet empire is really the collapse of two systems: the Soviet Union and the decolonization of the 1950's and 1960's.

63. Modern imperatives such as liberalization, peacemaking, empowerment of women and environmental protection all require additional levels of law and order in order to progress or succeed. Hence there is a need for strengthened linkages and strategic plans.

64. The UN is now active in 13 peacekeeping operations, but these are underfinanced, and the UN has lacked dedicated intelligence, e.g. an operations room, until recently. Examples: Bosnia is - or should be - a "humiliation" to Europe; Cambodia is a powerless state which risks breakdown; Mozambique - the UN has 7,000 to 8,000 troops but is 6 months behind schedule; with respect to Angola, the UN is short staffed, and civil war is imminent. In the case of Somalia the UN is clearly discredited.

65. Military "power" is more important now in order to regain stability. The US has the political will and military capability, but the operation needs to be internationalized. Europe has need of political will. How this 'Will' was to materialize was left unsaid.

66. The criterion for US leadership depends on answers to questions such as: when, how to get in and how to get out are known; when the price is manageable; when CNN is involved to build domestic support (e.g. Somalian relief); where US is welcome; where there are no obstacles to military operations; where a threshold of butchery has been exceeded. These are large issues with no clear resolution. However, to our mind, they indicate the concerns and priorities of U.S. planning.

67. There is a lack of consensus on certain principles of operations concerning the value of human life and

boundaries. Much discussion took place on this particular issue with no solution in sight.

68. There is a need to replace the dismantling of 'old countries' with something else. This we found to be an odd statement.

69. The UN is a "global singles bar," but no one is in the market for "failed countries." The UN is not representative of the world but of countries of the world. We would say of the governments rather than the peoples of the world.

70. The US and the UN are looking for regional associations, like the OAS, to handle regional problems. In Europe, NATO is the enforcement arm of the CSCE; in Bosnia, multinational force should use force to cut off artillery and air strikes; the Vance/Owen map is "ridiculous." The agreement on the latter point was perhaps somewhat surprising but it was pronounced.

71. Concerning elections in new "democracies" - elections do not solve wars; they are often "ethnic plebiscites."

72. On population growth and resource shortages several points were made. Often there is plenty of land but not a good distribution system to get food to people; in "failed" countries young men emigrate or get a gun (e.g. Somalia); There is a need for an incentive structure to retain the best of the people. Here again there was considerable agreement.

The Future of U.S. Intelligence

73. An interesting and important session with **Dr. Gregory Treverton**, Deputy Director of National Security Command deserves mention. He stated that 'intelligence' was a very powerful culture, in fact he saw it to be more like a priesthood.

74. The characteristics of intelligence agencies were, according to Treverton, that real effort is required to get intelligence to policy makers due, in part, to the aloofness of the agencies themselves. He also brought up several points worth emphasizing here, namely:

- There is a difference between "Puzzles" (problems that are knowable with enough information) and "Mysteries" (questions that really need to be answered but where there is little or no useful information, e.g. Russia's future); intelligence is good at answering questions that no one asks (the Puzzles) but has had problems with 'Mysteries.'

- One difficulty for intelligence agencies is the need for breaking away from some of the traditions (e.g. the President's Daily Briefing or PDB) which Treverton described as time and labour intensive while largely ineffective. A new initiative under Clinton is the "Daily Economic Bulletin." Current intelligence is driving the PDB but there is a need to look beyond the next week or next month (e.g. Bosnia), otherwise there is a danger of losing sight of strategic aspects.

75. In Treverton's view it is hard to get economics and politics, or military and politics together - often there is a good political assessment with the economic analysis "strapped on" (e.g. in Europe, where the state of the Bundesbank is the important item, not NATO).

76. Furthermore, it is hard to separate Domestic and Foreign Policy (e.g. foreign policy for Japan has domestic aspects).

77. There is the need for a comparative advantage in intelligence. The US used to have the advantage over the USSR but this is not true now. Presently it is more tactical (e.g. military estimates of weapons; ozone negotiations). The real importance of intelligence is esentially to provide help where needed.

78. In the discussion which followed it became clear that concerning the Clinton foreign policy there is now a critical stage with the upcoming decision on Bosnia.

79. On the question of liaison with UN: this is seen as "ad-hoc information sharing." On the relationship between intelligence agencies and Congress it was felt that Congress sees everything, mostly through briefings. The Executive Branch is dominated by the In basket, and there is only a 15-16 month tenure for Secretaries. Congress representatives can pick and choose, they are consumers of intelligence and have longer tenures.

80. On a non-violent policy on Bosnia the question was raised why is there so little real discussion? The psychological profile of Serbian President Milosevic showed that the only thing that would change his mind is air

strikes on industrial centres in Bosnia. If this option is not acceptable perhaps the only non-violent option would be to put out a warrant on Milosevic whenever he leaves Bosnia.

81. On the shift from military intelligence to economic intelligence, - it is hard for government agencies to act here except to advise American companies of foreign intelligence activities. Why would this be, we wonder.

82. Concerning UN multilateralism - this is (or should be) the modus operandum for the Clinton administration, according to one speaker. Much agreement existed on this point.

83. On Cuba - is US policy reasonable? - The only option is to wait until Castro goes but watch for trouble with Miami Cubans, who want to return to Cuba and take back their old properties.

V. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

84. The forum on the worldwide future of Democracy and Study Conference gave us a very good appreciation for the various pressure points of U.S. foreign policy and a sense of where the U.N., Russia and relations with China and Japan fits in U.S. perception. The lack of attention to U.S. links to Canada, NATO/Europe or Latin America may have been due to the choice of themes and speakers or to their relatively lower urgency from a political point of view. Or so we thought.

85. The relatively low level of preoccupation of foreign policy makers with resource and environmental problems was somewhat surprising to us in view of the Clinton/Gore campaign themes. However, the priority on these topics may be rising with the increased emphasis of the administration on economics.

86. The many links between policy makers, intelligence agencies and external information gatherers, such as academics (or government scientists) was presented clearly along with their strengths and weaknesses.

87. The emphasis of US policy toward multilateralism clearly invites continued Canadian involvement internationally in both economic and military crisis issues. Strategic plans for weather and oceanographic support of CF operations need to take account of this as well as of the relatively lower priority for traditional at NATO/Warsaw Pact areas of potential conflict, such as the Arctic and North Atlantic. On the other hand, the Pacific offers new challenges with the rearming of Japan, China and Korea.

ANNEX A

Preliminary Program

Conference on Post-Cold War Peace and Security

Sponsored by

The Mershon Center
Ohio Arms Control Seminar
Ohio Peace Studies Consortium
United States Institute for Peace

Thursday, April 29

8:00 p.m. Forum: "The Worldwide Future of Democracy"
Mershon Auditorium, 30 W. 15th Avenue
Henry Kissinger
Oscar Arias
Hans Dietrich Genscher

Friday, April 30

8:00 - 8:30 a.m. Registration
Holiday Inn, 329 W. Lane Avenue

8:00 - 9:15 a.m. Breakfast Buffet (No scheduled event)

9:30 - 11:00 a.m. Welcome
Reactions to Thursday Evening Forum
Remarks by **Henry Kissinger**

11:00 - 12:15 a.m. "Applied and Scholarly Research and the Foreign Policy Process"
Chester Crocker, Former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs
Hrach Gregorian, Director of Grants, Education and Training Programs, USIP
Richard Herrmann, Mershon Center

12:30 - 1:30 Lunch

2:15 - 3:45 p.m.	"Expanding Knowledge and Promoting Education about Peace in a complicated World" An Overview of USIP **Hrach Gregorian** Support Services Available from USIP **Hrach Gregorian** Bibliographical and Literature Issues **Jeanne Bohlen**, Director Jeannette Library Program, USIP
3:45 p.m.	Coffee Break
4:00 - 5:30 p.m.	Religious Perspectives on the Use of Force **Colonel Craig Anderson** U.S. Army National Guard and Episcopal Bishop of South Dakota **Fr. John Langan** USIP Senior Research Fellow **Charles Chatfield** Professor of History Wittenberg University **Rev. Theodore Hesburgh** (Invited)
6:00 - 7:00 p.m.	No-Host Reception
7:00 p.m.	Dinner
	"Justice, Morality and U.S. Foreign Policy" **Chester Crocker** Chairman, USIP Board of Directors

Saturday, May 1

8:00 a.m.	Continental Breakfast
8:45 - 10:00 a.m.	"Whither Russia?" A Roundtable with **Kimberly Martin Zisk, George Hudson and Olga Medvedkov**
10:15 - 11:30 a.m.	"Intelligence Policy for the Post-Cold War Era: A Clinton Administration View" **Gregory Treverton** Deputy Director of National Intelligence Council
11:30 a.m.	Adjournment

ANNEX B

Ohio Arms Control Seminar

Participants List

April 30 - May 1, 1993

Mr. and Mrs. William Ahern
1703 Harwitch Road
Columbus, Ohio 43221

Rev. Dr. Craig Anderson, USA
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Mr. Tom Arnold
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dr. Oscar Arias Sánchez
Arias Foundation for Peace
and Human Progress
P.O. Box 8-6410-1000
San Jose, Costa Rica

Professor Richard Bald
Dept. of Political Science
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45433

Dr. George Beelen
Dept. of History
YSY/410 Wick Ave.
Youngstown, Ohio 44555
Athens, OH 45433

Ms. Lana Bernier
International Studies - OSU
121 1/2 W. 2nd Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dr. Robert Bestgen
708 Stonewood Court
Worthington, Ohio 43235

Professor Alan Beyerchen
OSU/Dept. of History
161 Dulles Hall
230 W. 17th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Ms. Jeanne Bohlen
U.S. Institute of Peace
1550 "M" Street N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-1708

Ms. Maureen Bright
1842A Riverside Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43212

Dr. M. A. Budge
Peace and Conflict Studies
English Dept.
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44555

Rev. Burt Cantrell
3668 Ridgewood Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43026

Professor Charles Chatfield
Department of History
Wittenberg University
Springfield, OH 45501

Dr. J. Ransom Clark
Dept. of Political Science
Muskingum College
New Concord, OH 43762

Ms. Mary Faith Conrad
1249 Bell Run Road
Fairmont, West Virginia 26554

Dr. Chester Crocker
United States Institute of Peace
1550 "M" Street N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-1708

Lt.Col. Louis Crooks, USA
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dr. John Czerapowicz
Dept. of Political Science
John Carroll University
University Heights, OH 44118

Ms. Sheila Darrow
124 Mount Hall
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Mr. Gonzalo Deleon
Hocking College
319 Elizabeth St.
Nelsonville, OH 45764

Dr. Ada B. Demb
300 Oxley Hall
1712 Neil Ave.
Columbus, OH 43210

Dr. Mark Denham
Political Science
University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606-3390

Maj. Dan Deitz, USMC
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Prof. Raymond Dominick
Department of History
OSU, Mansfield Campus
Mansfield, Ohio 44906

Dr. Simon Duke
Department of Political Science
Penn State University
114 Burrows Bldg.
Univeristy Park, PA 16802

Dr. Lorraine Eden
26 Plympton Street
Cambridge, Massachussetts 02138

Dr. Erwin Epstein
325 Oxley Hall
1712 Neil Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Mr. and Mrs. Bill Ferguson
120 E. Northwood Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Prof. Richard Flickinger
Dept. of Political Science
Wittenberg University
Springfield, OH 45501

Mr. Hans Dietrich Genscher
Harry Walker Agency
1 Penn Plaza
New York, New York 10119

Dr. Hrach Gregorian
United States Institute of Peace
1550 "M" Street N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-1708

Professor James Harf
Mershon Center
Ohio State University
199 W. 10th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

Dr. Richard J. Harknett
Dept. of Political Science
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375

Prof. Thomas Haugsby
Antioch College
795 Livermore
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

LTC Glenn Hayes, Jr.
Army ROTC
253 Converse Hall
2121 Tuttle Park Place
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Prof. Charles Hermann
Mershon Center
199 W. 10th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

Dr. John Hermann
1010 E. Street
Corinado, California

Prof. Margaret Hermann
Mershon Center
199 W. 10th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

Prof. Richard Herrmann
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

Ms. Margaret Holfinger
2869 North Lake Ct.
Columbus, Ohio 43231

Dr. Mary K. Howard
Dept. of History
John Carroll University
Cleveland, OH 44118

Dr. Daniel Howland
FASTC/TANM
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-6508

Professor George Hudson
Dept. of Political Science
Wittenberg University
Springfield, OH 45501

Prof. William Jackson
Dept. of Political Science
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Ms. Maria Johnson
Hocking College
319 Elizabeth St.
Nelsonville, OH 45764

Dr. Margaret Karns
University of Dayton
300 College Park
Dayton, OH 45469-0001

Mr. Frank Kendrick
University of Akron
238 Orchard Street
Kent, Ohio 44240

Professor Jeffrey Kimball
Department of History
Miami University
Oxford, OH 45056

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger
Henry A. Kissinger Consulting Co.
1800 "K" Street N.W.
Suite 1021
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dr. Paul Kowert
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Ave.
Columbus, OH 43201

Prof. Joseph Kruzel
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Ave.
Columbus, OH 43201

Professor Joseph Kunkel
Dept. of Philosophy
University of Dayton
Dayton, OH 45469

Lt.Col. Don Lair
Mershon Center
199 W. 10th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

Fr. John Langan, S.J.
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Jeffrey Lantis
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Mr. Roy J. Lewicki
419 Hagerty Hall
1775 College Rd.
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Ms. Maggie Lewis
Ohoi Senate
1770 Northwest Blvd.
Columbus, Ohio 43212

Prof. Jeffrey Mao
Dept. of Political Science
Wittenberg University
Springfield, OH 45501

Mr. James E. McGoldrick
Cedarville College
Cedarville, Ohio 45314

Dr. Olga Medvedkov
Wittenberg University
Springfield, OH 45501

Dr. Thomas Milburn
Mershon Center
Ohio State University
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

Dr. Fred Milford
1411 London Drive
Columbus, OH 43221

Prof. Allan Millett
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Ave.
Columbus, OH 43201

LTC Robert Moberly
8812 Admiral Drive
Laurel, MD 20708

LTC Stephen Moeller, USA
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Professor Jon Moulton
Dept. of Political Science
Xavier University
Cincinnati, OH 45207

Dr. Williamson Murray
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Prof. Charles Overby
7815 Angel Rodge Road
Athens, Ohio 45701

S. Victor Papacosma
Lemnitzer Gtr for NATO/EC Studies
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242-0001

Prof. Alam Payind
International Studies
308 Dulles Hall
230 W. 17th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Prof. Mitchell Pote
Political Science
Dennison University
Granville, OH 43023

Mr. William I. Pugsley
Director General of Meteorology and
Oceanography
Dept. of National Defense
Ottawa, Canada

Dr. Edward Ray
Academic Affairs
204 Bricker Hall
190 N. Oval Mall
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dr. William Rennagel
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Mr. Donny Roush
Mershon Center
199 W. 10th Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Prof. Mark Rubin
The Lemnitzer Center
Kent State University
Kent, OH 44242

Mr. Ron Santoni
Dept. of Philosophy
Dennison University
Granville, Ohio 43023

Prof. James Scanlan
Slavic & E. European Studies
303 Oxley Hall
1712 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Prof. Paul Schroeder
Department of History
Univeristy of Illinois
607 S. Mathews Street
Urbana, IL 61801

Miriam Schwartz
Center for Slavic Studies
303 Oxley Hall
1712 Neil
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Ms. Ruth Searles
Dept. of Sociology
Toledo University
Toledo, Ohio 43606

Mr. Arnold E. Shaheen, Jr.
365 S. Main St.
P.O. Box 49
Pataskala, Ohio 43062

Prof. Gordon Shull
Dept. of Political Science
College of Wooster
Wooster, OH 44691

Professor Robert Smith
Dept. of History
University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606

Dr. Erik Solem
Interdepartmental Committee for
Futures and Forecasting
Department of National Defense
Ottawa, Canada

Ms. Kezia Sproat
184 E. Oakland Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Rep. Mike Stinziano
Mershon Center
199 W. 10th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

LTC John Storm, USA
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Prof. Taylor Stults
Dept. of History
Muskingum College
New Concord, OH 43762

Dr. Jeremiah Sullivan
Arms Control, Disarmament
and International Security
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

LTC Frank A. Titus
Ohio Air National Guard
1251 Harrison Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dr. Gregory F. Treverton
National Intelligence Council
Washington, D.C.

Mr. David Ulbrich
126 W. Dixon Ave.
Dayton, Ohio 45419

Dr. James Van Fleet
Director, Center for
Int'l Studies & Program
University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606-3390

Dr. Amos Yoder
127 S. Hempstead
Westerville, Ohio 43081

Professor Bin Yu
Department of Political Science
Wittenberg University
Springfield, OH 45501

Prof. Kimberly Zisk
Mershon Center
1478 Pennsylvania Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

ANNEX C

THE OHIO ARMS CONTROL SEMINAR

The Ohio Arms Control Seminar (OACS) was founded in 1976 by Allan Millett, Associate Director of the Mershon Center and then Director of its Program in International Security and Military Affairs. OACS began with a core group of Center Faculty Associates, other interested Ohio State faculty and a small number of individuals from other institutions in the state. It gradually expanded to a network of more than one hundred persons throughout the state and a small number of former associates scattered across the country.

The substantive problem orientation of OACS has been to address the interrelationship of the US-USSR competition and the avoidance of nuclear war through bilateral and multi-lateral negotiation. It helps to educate academics and interested persons in government and industry on the critical issues of foreign policy, military strategy, technology and negotiations.

The primary goals of the Ohio Arms Control Seminar have been to increase the analytic expertise of OACS members and thereby--given their roles--to contribute to public education on national security policy, especially arms control, issues throughout Ohio and in nearby states. A subsidiary goal has been to foster a sense of community among program participants which will facilitate a continuing informal sharing of the expertise that exists within the group.

The principal activities of OACS have been two conferences held each year. The conference programs have been designed to educate OACS members on current and emerging arms control developments and related issues. They have featured presentations by well-known outside experts from government and academia as well as presentations by its own members. In addition to lectures, panel discussions and film reviews, OACS members have organized and conducted sophisticated simulations of arms control negotiations and treaty ratification processes (SALT II). From time to time OACS has co-sponsored conferences with other organizations.

During the past five years more than one hundred different persons have participated in OACS meetings. There is a core group of approximately thirty persons who attend almost every meeting. OACS brings together persons with a wide variety of disciplinary and value perspectives. While political scientists and historians are the most numerous academics there are also physicists, engineers, philosophers, ethicists, linguists and literature scholars as well as military officers and persons from specialized research organizations.

ANNEX D

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

FACT SHEET

1550 M Street, NW, Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20005-1708 202 457-1700 Fax 202 429-6063

CONGRESSIONAL MANDATE

The United States Institute of Peace was created by an act of Congress in October 1984 to promote education and training, research, and public information programs on means to promote international peace and the resolution of international conflicts without violence. Congress vested the Institute with several important characteristics:

- status as an independent federal institution;
- insulation from the political realm of policymaking and political pressures, but ability to assist Congress, the Executive Branch, and others with research, analysis, and information;
- nonpartisan and nonideological programming;
- program funding exclusively by congressional appropriations.

Funding and Authorization: The Institute's Fiscal Year 1993 appropriation is $10,912,000. The Higher Education Reauthorization Act passed in 1992 extends the Institute's authorization through fiscal year 1997.

GOALS

- To increase basic and applied knowledge about the origins, nature, and processes of peace and war through research by experts with diverse views.
- To disseminate knowledge and practical lessons to policymakers, Congress, diplomats, journalists, educators and others engaged in efforts to promote international peace.
- To support public information, education and training programs about the complexities of international conflict and peacemaking.

ORIGINS

The Institute's origins can be traced to the earliest days of the Republic when drafters of the Constitution first debated the idea of a national peace institution. Between 1935 and 1976, over 140 bills were introduced to establish peace-related departments, agencies, bureaus, and standing committees of Congress. In 1981 a commission recommended the creation of a national peace academy, and in 1984 the United States Institute of Peace Act was signed into law.

ADMINISTRATION

The Institute is governed by a 15-member, presidentially appointed Board of Directors. Eleven members are drawn from outside the government and four federal officials serve *ex officio*. All members are confirmed by the Senate, and the private members serve for fixed four-year terms. No more than eight may be members of one political party. Institute staffing includes 49 permanent positions.

SPECIAL INITIATIVES

Middle East Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution

This initiative is focusing on issues affecting peace and stability in the Middle East, South and Central Asia, and the Transcaucasus. Primary activities include enhanced attention by existing grant and fellowship programs and a variety of internally directed study groups and special projects. A major aim of the initiative is to provide results and information to the Executive Branch, Congress, and the general public.

Selected Highlights:

- day-long symposium and a resulting monograph on the relationship between Islam and democracy and political development;
- study group, consisting of scholars, current and former U.S. policymakers and diplomats, and other experts, which considered lessons from past negotiations for current Arab-Israeli peacemaking efforts. A final report, *Making Peace Among Arabs and Israelis: Lessons from Fifty Years of Negotiating Experience*, was published just before the opening rounds of peace talks in Madrid and distributed widely among U.S. and other officials involved in the peace process;
- study group on the southern tier of former Soviet republics, focusing on their relationship with Russia and political and cultural orientation vis-a-vis societies in South Asia and the Middle East.

Rule of Law

Recognizing a relationship between the rule of law and conflict management, this initiative augments the Institute's core programs through a series of specialized projects.

Selected Highlights:

- 300-page volume of comments and recommendations on the draft Russian constitution by 17 American experts;
- regional directories of American resources and initiatives to advance rule of law in Eastern Europe, the former USSR, and Africa;
- country reports on the rule of law in Bulgaria, Ethiopia, and elsewhere;
- a project on the treatment of former officials during transitions from repressive to democratic governments.

Religion, Ideology, and Peace

A working group is examining the relationship between religion and nationalism as a source of conflict, with case studies on Ukraine, Sri Lanka, Lebanon, Nigeria, Sudan, Israel, and Tibet.

PROGRAMS

Grants

Awards to institutions and individuals in 39 states and 23 countries for research and analysis. Examples:

- a study of factors contributing to the attainment of cease-fires in selected conflicts in the Third World;
- an examination of regional confidence and security building measures, which might encourage states in South Asia, the Middle

East, and Latin America with nascent nuclear programs to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty;

- a case study of patterns of assimilation of migrants and refugees as part of a larger analysis of the current potential for ethnic conflict. Special attention is being given to questions of conflict resolution, societal integration, and voluntary return to home countries;

- a project analyzing the social, economic and political costs of military expenditure in Central America and recommending new policies aimed at transferring resources to promote development without weakening internal or regional security.

Research and Studies (partial list)

Dialogues on Conflict Resolution: Bridging Theory and Practice
In July 1992, the Institute convened a three-day highly interactive conference, gathering scholars, diplomats and other practitioners to discuss negotiation, mediation, problem-solving, and other techniques for peacemaking in Kashmir, Nagorno-Karabakh, Mozambique, Peru, and Yugoslavia.

Professionalization of Peacekeeping
The Institute has convened a study group examining the role, organization, and structure of the UN system and its Secretariat in deploying peacekeeping forces, including relationships with the field command authority.

Fellowships

Distinguished Fellows—eminent (in residence) persons with careers marked by extraordinary achievement. Example:

- James Goodby, former U.S. Ambassador to Finland, is conducting research on security and peacekeeping in the new Europe, focusing on prospects, modalities, and strategies.

Peace Fellows—persons whose careers demonstrate considerable accomplishment and promise of future leadership (in residence). Examples:

- Nancie Gonzalez, professor of anthropology at the University of Maryland, is examining ways in which rapid social and economic change generates ethnic tensions and promotes the redefinition of ethnic identities in Central America, the Middle East and elsewhere.
- Elizabeth Teague, senior research analyst, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, is conducting a survey of minority groups in Russia and neighboring republics of the former Soviet Union, identifying factors that may give rise to or ameliorate potential conflicts and how these conflicts could involve other nations.

Peace Scholars—outstanding students undertaking doctoral research (out-of-residence).

Education and Training (partial)

- *National Peace Essay Contest* (high school) —students are asked if the United States should direct its resources to help avoid or resolve international conflict or assume a less engaged global role in light of the recent dramatic changes in the international system.

- *Educational television project*: "Breaking the Mold" — a five-part video series designed for high school and college classroom use, examines the relationship among the United States, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe during the Cold War years. Each 28-minute segment is accompanied by a teacher's guide.

- Grant support for high school and university-level teacher training and curriculum development and professional training programs. Examples:
  - -High school computer simulations, ancillary materials, and related courses on international negotiations and intercultural communications.
  - -Dispute resolution training in Moscow and Warsaw suitable for nationality and other civil conflicts.

Library and Information Services (partial)

Core collection, bibliographic development and classification systems, and support to other libraries.

Distributing *Guides to Library of Congress Subject Headings and Classification on Peace and International Conflict Resolution*—reference books for librarians and scholars to facilitate access to information on international peace.

Spark M. Matsunaga Medal of Peace

Congress has authorized the Institute to award annually this national peace medal. Nominations are sought for persons who have made extraordinary contributions to world peace, especially in ways which enhance society's knowledge and skills in peacemaking.

Public Outreach

Speakers, seminars, workshops, and media services.

Publications

- *Journal*, a bimonthly newsletter.

- *In Brief . . .*, a series of digests highlighting the work of grantees, fellows, and research projects.

- Books and monographs (partial list): *Resolving Third World Conflict*, Brown & Schraub; *Approaches to Peace: An Intellectual Map*, Thompson, et al; *Morality and Foreign Policy: Realpolitik Revisited; Forceful Persuasion*, Alexander George.

- Special Reports (partial list): *The OAS and Democratic Development; Relief, Reconciliation, and Reconstruction in Somalia.*

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chester A. Crocker (chairman), Distinguished Research Professor of Diplomacy, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service

Max M. Kampelman (vice chairman), Esq., Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Jacobson, Washington, D.C.

Dennis L. Bark, senior fellow, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University

Thomas E. Harvey, senior vice president and general counsel, Corporation for Public Broadcasting

Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president emeritus, University of Notre Dame

William R. Kintner, professor emeritus of political science, University of Pennsylvania

Christopher H. Phillips, former United States ambassador to Brunei

Elspeth Davies Rostow, professor of government, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin

Mary Louise Smith, civic activist, former national chairman of the Republican party

W. Scott Thompson, director, international development studies, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University

Allen Weinstein, president, The Center for Democracy, Washington, D.C.

Ex officio members

Les Aspin, secretary of defense

Lieutenant General Paul G. Cerjan, United States Army, president, National Defense University

Thomas Graham, Jr., acting director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Melvyn Levitsky, assistant secretary of state for international narcotics matters

Ex officio (nonvoting)

Charles E. Nelson, acting president, United States Institute of Peace.

March 1993

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF FORM
(highest classification of Title, Abstract, Keywords)

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)

1. ORIGINATOR (the name and address of the organization preparing the document. Organizations for whom the document was prepared, e.g. Establishment sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, are entered in section 8.)

DIRECTORATE OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSIS
NATIONAL DEFENCE HEADQUARTERS
OTTAWA, CANADA

2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (overall security classification of the document. including special warning terms if applicable)

UNCLASSIFIED

3. TITLE (the complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification should be indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S,C or U) in parentheses after the title.)

WHITHER DEMOCRACY AND SECURITY?
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE FORUM ON "THE WORLDWIDE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY" AND THE CONFERENCE ON POST-COLD WAR PEACE AND SECURITY

4. AUTHORS (Last name, first name, middle initial)

SOLEM, ERIK

5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (month and year of publication of document)	6a. NO. OF PAGES (total containing information. Include Annexes, Appendices, etc.)	6b. NO. OF REFS (total cited in document)
JUNE 1993	44	

7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (the category of the document, e.g. technical report, technical note or memorandum. If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g. interim, progress, summary, annual or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.)

8. SPONSORING ACTIVITY (the name of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development. Include the address.)

9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (if appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant)	9b. CONTRACT NO. (if appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written)

10a. ORIGINATOR'S DOCUMENT NUMBER (the official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document.)	10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NOS. (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor)

11. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY (any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification)

(X) Unlimited distribution
( ) Distribution limited to defence departments and defence contractors; further distribution only as approved
( ) Distribution limited to defence departments and Canadian defence contractors; further distribution only as approved
( ) Distribution limited to government departments and agencies; further distribution only as approved
( ) Distribution limited to defence departments; further distribution only as approved
( ) Other (please specify):

12. DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT (any limitation to the bibliographic announcement of this document. This will normally correspond to the Document Availabilty (11). However, where further distribution (beyond the audience specified in 11) is possible, a wider announcement audience may be selected.)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF FORM

DCD03 2/96/87

13. ABSTRACT (a brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both offical languages unless the text is bilingual).

This report provides an overview and assessment of a major international study conference on International Peace and Security and its relevance to Canadian Security Policy.

14. KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS (technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus. e.g. Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus-identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
POST-COLD WAR
MERSHON CENTRE
INTERNATIONAL PEACE